UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,546 04/24/2006		Magnus Holgesson	8722.009.US0000	7403
77176 Novak, Druce &	7590 01/22/200 & Ouigg LLP	EXAMINER		
1300 I Street, N	I.W.	WALTERS, JOHN DANIEL		
Suite 1000, Wes WASHINGTO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/572,546	HOLGESSON, MAG	SNUS	
Examiner	Art Unit		

	JOHN D. WALTERS	3618				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (to MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f.).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slaset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
 3. ⊠ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con						
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or	orroonanding number of finally rais	acted alaima				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number or finally reje	cteu ciaims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 Soo attached Notice of Non Co.	mpliant Amondment (DTOL 324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpilant Amendment (F TOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subifiilled iii a separale, l	illiely liled afficilidifier	it canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5,7,8 and 10-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will not	: be entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 1. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Christopher P Ellis/	/J. D. W./					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3618	Examiner, Art Unit 3618					
	,					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant states, However, Dickinson only shows a lid having four discrete depressions (best shown but un-numbered in figures 1 and 3 of Dickinson) to receive one each of simple axle mounted wheels. Thus the proposed combination of Uitz and Broadley and Dickinson still would not provide a lid which in the lid has the claimed structure i.e. "the upper surface of the lid being provided with two parallel narrow long side channels of the lid stretching from one short side of the lid to the other, the long side channel of the lid being arranged at a distance from each of other which is mainly equal to the distance between the wheels, as seen from a short side"."

Applicant appears to be arguing against the individual references contained within the combination rejection without taking into account the manner in which they were combined. The prior rejection clearly states that Dickinson is relied upon for a teaching of the placement of a receiving means upon a lid while Broadley is relied upon to teach two narrow parallel side channels.

For this reason, the rejections stand.